

REMARKS

Claims 13 to 15, 17, 18, 22 to 22 and 24 are in this application and are presented for consideration. By this amendment, Applicant has made changes to each of the independent claims. Amended claim 13 includes features of now canceled claim 16. Amended claim 17 includes features of now canceled claim 19. Amended claim 21 includes features of now canceled claim 23. The claim 24 has been added.

Claim 13 has been objected to based on informalities. Applicant has now revised claim 13 paying close attention to the Examiner's comments. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the helpful comments.

Claims 13 to 23 have been rejected as being anticipated by Priest. The rejection is based on the position that Priest teaches each and every feature as claimed.

The invention as claimed provides a combination of features including a sliding block, such as referenced by 2 in the application. This sliding block fits inside a groove (see 6.1 in Figure 2). The blocking member, such as referenced by 3 in the application, is a structure connected to the sliding block and which blocks or fixes the position of the cam rail (5) relative to the groove rail (6). The blocking member is outside the groove of the groove rail in order to press the cam rail to the front side of the groove rail.

In the rejection it is stated (see page 3 of the Office Action) that fastening element 95 of Priest (e.g., Figure 8) is considered a sliding block. This appears to be a reasonable consideration as the fastening element 95 is arranged inside the undercut groove of the groove rail. However, in the rejection it is stated that element 95, 140 is the blocking member. This

structure is not arranged outside the groove as according to the claimant structure (fastening element 95 is arranged inside the undercut groove of the groove rail). In the device taught by Priest the blocking member is formed by the nut 119 (see Figures 8, 21 and 30 of Priest) which is arranged outside the groove and presses another part (e.g., the angle bracket 140 (see figure 21), onto the grooved rail.

It cannot be said that the blocking member of Priest has a blocking member groove. Further, what is referred to as the cam rail does not have the protruding portion extending into the blocking member groove for positive lateral fixing of the cam rail to the blocking member. Accordingly, it is Applicant's position that the office action is not correct at least with regard to the combination as now presented in the independent claims. The only part of the Priest reference which is provided with a groove (grooves 99, 101) is the fastening elements 95, i.e., the sliding block that extends inside the groove (as best seen in Figure 8 and especially in Figure 30).

It is believed that the claims as now presented set forth a novel and unobvious combination that defines over the prior art including Priest. Further, is Applicant's position that the claims as presented define a combination of features which is not suggested by the prior art as a whole, including the teachings and suggestions of Priest. The references fail to suggest a blocking member with groove cooperating with a cam rail's protruding portion as claimed in the present application. The claimed subject matter would not have been considered obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

According to the invention, the blocking number has a groove that provides for a

positive lateral fixing of the cam rail. With this structure the cam rail (which is pressed onto the grooved rail by means of the blocking member) is arranged outside the groove of the grooved rail) and is fixedly attached to the grooved rail. The cam rail is then prevented from any rotational movements with respect to the blocking member.

According to the teachings of Priest, the sliding blocks grooves (99, 101) serve to attach the sliding block inside the groove of the groove rail to an inwardly protruding flange (52, 56; Figure 8, 30 etc.), so that "the sharp ridges of the groove will bite into the respective cooperating surfaces of the edge of the re-entrant flange [...] and in effect will produce permanent deformations in said edges" (see column 4, lines 34-39). Such an arrangement may prevent the sliding block from a rotating movement with respect to the groove rail. However, as is apparent, the structure would fail to provide a positive lateral fixing of a cam rail with respect to the blocking member (i.e., nut 119 according to Priest). And as such the left part "B" in figure 30 may be rotatable around the axis of T-bolt (96) with respect to the middle part "B" as no positive fit is provided between nut (119) and left part "B". Moreover, providing the sliding member (i.e. part 96 according to Priest) with grooves would not be necessary in the present invention as a groove rail does not (necessarily) comprising inwardly protruding flange as the rail according to Priest does (elements 52 and 56).

Accordingly, it is Applicant's position that the claims as now presented patently define over the prior art as a whole. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider the subject matter now presented in the independent claims.

Favorable consideration on the merits is requested.

Respectfully submitted  
for Applicant,

By: 

John James McGlew

Registration No. 31,903

McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

JJM:jms/jj  
70436RCE.4

DATED: July 23, 2004  
SCARBOROUGH STATION  
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-0827  
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-  
0410.